

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/708,281	CHISTYAKOV, ROMAN	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Angela M. Lie	2821	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Angela M. Lie (Examiner). (3) Kurt Rauschenbach (Attorney).
 (2) Wilson Lee (Primary Examiner). (4) Roman Chistyakov (Inventor).

Date of Interview: 27 March 2006.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 21, 38 and 47.

Identification of prior art discussed: _____.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The attorney requested a phone interview in order to clarify the invention and to show the differences between existing strongly-ionized plasma generators and the one claimed in the current application. The examiner suggested to incorporate additional limitation regarding reducing arc by controlling the magnitude and the rise time of the voltage pulse, in order to differentiate current invention from the previously existing devices. On April 20, 2006 the attorney made correction to the all independent claims which are reflected in examiner's amendment. The changes made in the claims, place the application in the condition for allowance.